

Appln No. 09/722,148
Reply Dated January 05, 2006

6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant hereby withdraws the Amendment filed on April 28, 2005 which the Examiner has disapproved.

In place of the withdrawn Amendment, the Applicant encloses herewith a replacement Listing of Claims which replaces the Listing of Claims submitted with Amendment A in the Applicant's Reply to the Office Action of August 17, 2004. The replacement Listing of Claims provides a complete Claim 20, as requested by the Examiner in the email of April 26, 2005.

As Claim 20 was designated as "(Original)" in the Applicant's Amendment A, it is clear that the complete Claim 20 in the enclosed replacement Listing of Claims is not a further amendment of the claims. That is, the claims included in the replacement Listing of Claims are clearly those claims which were allowed by the Examiner for the reasons stated in the Notice of Allowance dated March 23, 2005.

Regarding the Examiner's explanation for disapproval under part 1.d) of the Response to Rule 312 Communication, it is respectfully submitted that the designated "(Currently Amended)" claims 1, 11 and 16 in the withdrawn Amendment were the same as claims 1, 11 and 16 amended in the Applicant's Amendment A. Therefore, the scope of claims 1, 11 and 16 was not changed from that which was allowed by the Examiner in the Notice of Allowance dated March 23, 2005 contrary to the Examiner's contention.

Further, the Examiner contends that, with respect to claims 11 and 16, it is unclear what part of the network stores the data. That Applicant respectfully disagrees, because it is unnecessary with regard to the clarity of the scope of allowed claim 11 to recite what part of the network stores the data, and because allowed claim 16 clearly recites that the network server stores the data (similar to allowed claim 1).

Appin No. 09/722,148
Reply Dated January 05, 2006

7

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 16 included in the replacement Listing of Claims are the same as those included in the Applicant's Amendment A which the Examiner allowed in the Notice of Allowance dated March 23, 2005. Thus, it is respectfully requested that if the Examiner now believes that the subject matter of claims 11 and 16 is unpatentable, then the Examiner take action under 37 CFR §1.313(b). Otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner allow this application to issue with the complete Claim 20 as included in the replacement Listing of Claims.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762